

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/003,589	11/26/2001	Timothy R. Williams	08152-00134	4749	
27144	7590 04/15/2003				
FOSTER, SWIFT, COLLINS & SMITH, P.C.			EXAMINER		
LANSING, M	'ASHINGTON SQUARE 48933		BRATLIE, STEVEN A		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3652		
				DATE MAILED: 04/15/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

				/\/
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	illian	15 /
Office Action Summary	Examiner BRA	TLIE	Group Art Unit	0
—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears	on the cover sheet	t beneath the co	orrespondence ad	idress-
Period for Response	•	$\overline{}$		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE IS SEMAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.	T TO EXPIRE	MONT	H(S) FROM THE	
 Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 from the mailing date of this communication. If the period for response specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a If NO period for response is specified above, such period shall, by defail a Failure to respond within the set or extended period for response will, by 	response within the statult, expire SIX (6) MONT	tutory minimum of the HS from the mailing	hirty (30) days will be o g date of this communi	considered timely.
Status				
☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on				
☐ This action is FINAL .				
☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935			the merits is clos	sed in
Disp sition of Claims				
$\mathcal{H}^{Claim(s)} = 1-19$	is/are	is/are pending in the application.		
Of the above claim(s)	is/are	is/are withdrawn from consideration.		
☐ Claim(s)		is/are	allowed.	
16 Claim(s) 1-19	is/are	is/are rejected.		
☐ Claim(s)				
□ Claim(s)				
Application Papers		require		
☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing	Review. PTO-948.			
The proposed drawing correction, filed on 3/14/0	2_ is Xapproved	d 🗆 disapprove	d.	
The proposed drawing correction, filed on is/are objecte	d to by the Examine	r.		
☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.				
$\hfill\Box$ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)				
 □ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority und □ All □ Some* □ None of the CERTIFIED copies of th □ received. 	- ,			
☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number)			
☐ received in this national stage application from the Intern			··	
*Certified copies not received:			•	
Attachm nt(s)				
Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No	(s). <u>2</u>	Interview Sumr	nary, PTO-413	
Notice of References Cited, PTO-892			nal Patent Applicat	ion. PTO-152

U. S. Patent and Trademark Office PTO-326 (Rev. 3-97)

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

Part of Paper No.

□ Other_____

Office Acti n Summary

Application/Control Number: 10/003,589

Art Unit: 3652

1. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the features of claims 11-14, 17 and 18 must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:
 - 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
 - 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
 - 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
 - 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
- 4. Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hackett in view of Rice, Oudsten et al, Lee et al, and McGonigle et al.

Hackett, discloses a substantially similar vehicle incheding a hatch door #7 and movable floor #9. Hackett floor does not pivot, have an associated dolly and switch, and does not have sensors. Rice and Oudsten et al disclose a floor that pivots around a

Art Unit: 3652

et al discloses the use of sensors. It would have been obvious to a mechanic with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide these features to the primary reference. The motivation to provide a hinge embodiment is the known use of equivalent. The use of a dolly, switch and sensors aids in loading.

- 5. The remaining references are cited to show similar structure.
- 6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Examiner Bratlie whose telephone number is (703) 308-2669. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 6:30 to 5:00. Friday is the examiner's day off.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application of proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 306-4177.

Bratlie/kn April 10, 2003

> STEVEN A. BRATLIE PRIMARY EXAMINER

Steven a. Brathe

Page 3